

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER POR PATENTS PO Box (430) Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.orupo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,236	11/09/2001	James F. Zucherman	5910-162	6669
65901 7590 09/24/2008 COATS & BENNETT/MEDTRONIC 1400 CRESCENT GREEN			EXAMINER	
			COMSTOC	COMSTOCK, DAVID C
SUITE 300 CARY, NC 27	518		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3733	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/037,236	ZUCHERMAN ET A	L.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
DAVID COMSTOCK	3733		

this the est
. In TWO
e
fee !) as led,
of ice a
the
f
ind
а
f

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The endcap is disposed generally transverse to the longitudinal axis of the shaft (i.e., a line which would extend vertically up the center of Fig. 3) at least because it is positioned to extend (i.e. thickness) in a direction that is transverse to the longitudinal axis of the shaft. It is certainly not unreasonable to construe the endcap as being disposed generally transverse to the longitudinal axis of the shaft, since the meaning of the term "disposed" is broad and admits of various interpretations and more importantly, the thickness of the endcap extends in a transverse or radial, outward direction. As such, it occupies a position that would be on an annular frame of reference with respect to the shaft. Likewise, Examiner's interpretation of the endcap facing the spacer is not unreasonably broad, but rather is quite literal. It is Applicant's responsibility to draft the claims to overcome any ambiguity that may be present. It is also noted that assemblies are formed by assembling the individual components thereof. Therefore, when referring to an assembly (as is shown by Voydeville), it is a distinction without a difference to say "integrally assembled" instead of "integrally formed". Moreover, without the pin being secured in place by the endcap, the spacer could not be longitudinally constrained, since the parts would not be assembled and there would be no structure in place to retain the spacer. Therefore, the endcap, together with other elements, indeed constrains displacement of the spacer. Applicant's arguments pertaining to the parallel but differing claim terminology between claims 60+ and 128+ is without merit, as Applicant clearly understood the relationship of the terms and addressed the rejection accordingly. Finally, the terminology set forth in the rejection primarily addresses the currently pending claims but may address limitations that were previously pending and/or that potentially could be added again by amendment. As at least what is claimed has been referenced and discussed, it should not be a problem to describe the nature of the reference. Accordingly, the Examiner maintains the finality of the outstanding rejection.

Note regarding item 7 above: The after-final request for reconsideration will be entered (the form indicates "proposed amendment(s)").